

# Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

9 Kislev 5771

Zevachim Daf 6

Nov. 16, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of  
**Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for her neshamah and may her soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,  
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: [aneinu@gmail.com](mailto:aneinu@gmail.com)

## Daily Daf

### *Inherited Sacrifice*

Rav Assi said to Rav Ashi: and from it (*Rabbi Yochanan's halachah that the heirs cannot effect temurah*) it may be proven (*that they do indeed acquire it*), for if you would maintain that they do in fact acquire it, this would explain why a single heir would be able to effect *temurah*; however, if you hold that the heirs do not acquire it, how can a single heir effect *temurah*? Did Rabbi Avahu not say in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that if someone consecrates an animal (*for his friend's korban*), the consecrator redeems it (*after it developed a blemish*) by paying the full price plus one fifth of its value. The one who receives atonement (*the friend*) can effect *temurah*. And one who separates *terumah* from his grain in order to exempt someone else's grain, he has the benefit of gratitude (*he may decide which Kohen to give it to*). [*We see from here that only the owner of the korban can effect temurah; accordingly, it is difficult – if the heirs do not acquire the korban, how can a single heir effect temurah?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Although the heirs do not receive a regular atonement for this sacrifice, they do receive a peripheral atonement (*and this is sufficient enough of an ownership for them to effect temurah*).

The *Gemora* inquired: [*In a case where the korban was slaughtered not for its sake, where the halachah is that it may be offered but it does not count for the fulfillment of the owner's obligation, and he would be required to bring a different korban for his obligation...*] Do they effect atonement in respect of the purpose (*the sin*) for which they came, or do they not effect atonement?

Rav Shisha the son of Rav Idi said: It is logical to assume that it does not effect atonement, for if you would think that it does, what would be the purpose of the second sacrifice?

But, the *Gemora* counters, if it does not effect atonement, why then is it offered?

Rav Ashi answered: Rav Shisha the son of Rav Idi had the following difficulty: It is well (*that the second sacrifice is offered*) if you say that the first ones do not effect atonement; for although it was slaughtered not for its own sake, yet it comes on the strength of having been consecrated for its own sake. The second sacrifice comes to effect atonement. But if you say that the first ones effect atonement, what is the purpose for offering the second? (6a)

### *Providing Atonement for Sins Committed after Korban's Designation*

They inquired: Does an *olah* provide atonement for the violation of a positive commandment committed after the consecration of the animal, or not? Do we say that it should be analogous to a *chatas*: just as a *chatas* effects atonement only for the sins committed before its consecration, but not for those committed after it has been consecrated, so here too it effects atonement only for the sins committed before consecration, but not for those committed after consecration. Or, perhaps, it is not comparable to a *chatas*, for a separate *chatas* is required for each sin, whereas here, since it effects atonement if he had been guilty of violating many positive commandments, it may also effect atonement for positive commandments violated after its consecration?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: *and he shall lean his hand upon the head of an olah, and acceptance shall be gained for him, to atone for him.*

*Semichah*, leaning, does not atone, because one only gains atonement when the blood of the sacrifice is thrown, as it is said *for it is the blood that, through the soul, atones*. When it is said *and he shall lean.... and acceptance shall be gained*, it means that if one views *semichah* as the residue of a *mitzvah*, which means that he does not view *semichah* as an actual commandment, and he did not do the *semichah*, it is considered as if it did not effect atonement, although in reality it did effect atonement. [*This means that although one does gain atonement for his transgression through the sacrifice, he has not fulfilled the commandment of Hashem in the best possible manner.*] Now does this not mean that he did effect atonement with respect of the positive commandments violated before the consecration of the animal, while he did not effect atonement with respect of the positive commandment of *semichah*, because it is a positive commandment violated after consecration!

Rava said: *Semichah* is different, because as long as he has not yet slaughtered the animal, he is subject to the commandment of performing the *semichah*; when has it been violated? It is only after the slaughtering; and with respect of a commandment violated after the slaughtering, there was no inquiry at all (*for certainly, it will not atone for that*).

Rav Huna ben Yehudah said to Rava: Perhaps the *braisa* when it stated that “it effects atonement,” was referring to the person (*for all positive commandments – including his neglecting to perform semichah*), and when the *braisa* stated that “it does not effect atonement,” it means with respect of Heaven (*for he did not offer this korban in the desired manner*).

Proof to this interpretation is brought from the following *Mishna*: *And the remainder of the oil that is on the Kohen's palm (he shall place upon the head of the person being cleansed), to effect atonement for him before Hashem*. If he placed it on the *metzora's* head, he has effected atonement; while if he did not place it, he did not effect atonement (*and the metzora is still tamei*); these are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri said: It is but the residue of the *mitzvah*; therefore whether he did place it on his head or whether he did not, he effected atonement, yet it is considered as if he did not effect atonement.

What did Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri mean when he said, “as if he did not effect atonement”? Shall we say that he must bring another sacrifice? But didn't he say: “Whether he did place it on his head or whether he did not, he effected atonement”? It therefore must mean, “it effects atonement,” regarding the person, and “yet it is considered as if he did not effect atonement” - before Heaven. Then here too (*by an olah without semichah*) it may mean the same.

Rava rejects this explanation: Perhaps there too it means that “he has effected atonement” with respect of placing it on the thumbs of the *metzora*, but “yet it is considered as if he did not effect atonement” is with respect of the placing it on his head.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon said: For what purpose are the two he-goats of *Shavuos* brought? It is to provide atonement for the *tumah* of the Temple and its holy things. Now once the blood of the first goat has been sprinkled, for what purpose is the second one offered? It is to provide atonement for *tumah* which occurred in the interval between this one and that one. From this it may be said that it would have been fitting for Israel to perpetually offer their sacrifices (*for perhaps, someone from Israel, at every moment, sinned with respect of tumah*), but the Torah spared them. Now in this case, it is a positive command that has been violated after the consecration of the animals, yet it effects atonement!

The *Gemora* rejects the proof, for if they were consecrated at the same time, that indeed would be so; but the circumstances were that they were consecrated one after the other (*and the sin occurred before the designation of the second one*).

The *Gemora* asks: Are we then to arise and interpret the Torah's verse to be referring only to a case where the two goats were designated one after the other?

Rav Papp rejects the proof for the following reason: Public sacrifices are different, because *Beis Din* stipulates concerning them (*that even if the two goats were designated at the same time, the designation of the second one should not take effect until it is ready to be offered; this is done in order that it may atone for any tumah violations occurring between its original designation and the time that it is offered*). This is in accordance with that which Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel; for he said that in the case of communal offerings, it is the knife that directs them to what they could be (*even if the one who is slaughtering is not aware of the korban's purpose*). (6a – 6b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *How much Charity should one Give if he Forgot to Put on Tefillin?*

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

In the era of the author of *Panim Meiros*, about 260 years ago, a certain person discovered that for a long while he had not been putting on *tefillin* properly. Frightened and

confused, he remembered that the *Remo* remarks in *Shulchan Aruch*, O.C. 334:26 that someone who unwittingly desecrated *Shabbos* “must fast Mondays and Thursdays for 40 days and must not drink wine or eat meat. Instead of a *chatas*, he should give 18 *peshitin* to charity; if he wants to redeem the fast, he should give 12 *peshitin* for each day.” He wondered if for every day that he didn’t put on *tefillin*, he should fast and give that amount to charity (according to the opinions that each day is a *mitzvah* in itself; see *Beur Halachah*, beginning of §37) and referred his question to Rabbi Meir Eisenstat, the author of *Panim Meiros*.

**The difference between a *chatas* and an ‘*olah*:** In his reply (Responsa, III, 9), the author of *Panim Meiros* takes the trouble to place matters correctly, as explained in our *sugya*. We must distinguish between a *chatas* and an ‘*olah*. Someone who unwittingly transgresses a prohibition whose punishment is *kareis* if committed willingly **must** bring a *chatas*. However, regarding someone who neglected a positive *mitzvah* or who transgressed a negative *mitzvah* connected to a positive one (*lav hanitak la’aseh*), it is **fitting** that he bring an ‘*olah*, but he doesn’t have to. Aside from this essential difference, our *Gemora* also explains that if a person transgresses a number of prohibitions, he brings a *chatas* for each one whereas if he ignores a number of positive *mitzvos*, he brings one ‘*olah* for all. It is clear, then, that the person who didn’t put on *tefillin* for a long time does not have to fast and give charity for each of those days.

In addition, as opposed to a *chatas*, which is meant to atone, our *Gemora* explains that an ‘*olah* is considered a gift, “like a person who disobeyed a king and appeased him...and when he comes to greet him, brings a gift” (Rashi, 7b, s.v. ‘*Olah*). Therefore, we cannot compare a person who transgressed a prohibition atoned by a *chatas* to one who transgressed a *mitzvah* atoned by an ‘*olah*.

**Why we don’t say “to atone” on *Shabbos*:** The fact that an ‘*olah* is a gift and not an atonement also influences the formulation of prayers for *Shabbos*. The *Tur* (O.C. 283) rules: “...and in *musaf* for *Shabbos* there is no sacrifice to atone as they are all ‘*olos*.” In other words, as all *Shabbos* sacrifices are ‘*olos*, we do not conclude their verses with *lechaper* - “to atone”, as we do on holidays, when *chataos* were also offered (see *Birkei Yosef*, O.C. 283, S.K. 1, and *Eilyah Rabah*, os 3).

**Do sheep launder or conquer?** Apropos our *Gemora*’s description of an ‘*olah* as a gift, we should mention the Chacham Tzvi (a *mechutan* of the *Panim Meiros*), who cites, in the name of *Yalkut Shim’oni* (*Pinchas*, *remez* 776), that Beis Hillel and Beis Shamai disagreed as to the reason for the name *keves* (“sheep”). Beis Shamai hold that they suppress or overcome (*koveshim*) sins and Beis Hillel

explain that they launder (*kovesim*) sins. In the opinion of the Chacham Tzvi, they disagree as to if an ‘*olah* suppresses a sin and hides it, like a gift meant to cover up for the past, or if it launders a sin and cleans the stain, like a *chatas* (*Tosfos Chadashim*, 66).

## ***The Difference Between a Pauper and a Rich Person***

In the *parashah* concerning the atonement of a rich leper (*metzora*’), we are told “...and the *kohen will atone* for him before Hashem” (Vayikra 14:18) whereas concerning the atonement of a poor *metzora*’, the Torah says “**to atone** for him before Hashem” (ibid, 29). *Meshech Chochmah* says that this change in language stems from that *tzara’as* afflicts a person because of pride. Therefore, we can understand a rich person who is proud and when he is anointed with oil, “the *kohen will atone* for him” – his atonement is complete. However, a proud pauper is one of those whom Hashem rejects, as the *Gemora* says in Pesachim 113b: “Four are not tolerated: a proud pauper,” etc. Therefore, his sin his great and about him we are told “**to atone** for him before Hashem” – his atonement is not over yet.

## ***The Importance of an Olah from a Bird and a Chatas from a Large Animal***

Some sacrifices have their blood sprinkled on the Altar above the *chut hasikra* and some have their blood sprinkled below it. The blood of an ‘*olah* from a bird is sprinkled above the *chut hasikra* while the blood of a *chatas* from a bird is sprinkled below it. On the other hand, the blood of an ‘*olah* from a large animal is sprinkled below the *chut hasikra* while the blood of a *chatas* from a large animal is sprinkled above it.

The Chozeh of Lublin zt”l said: The poor, who cannot afford to buy cattle or sheep, bring sacrifices from birds while the rich bring sacrifices from large animals. Since it is no *chidush* that a rich person should bring an ‘*olah* sacrifice from a large animal, the blood of his sacrifice is sprinkled below. But if he belittled himself, admitted his sin and brought a *chatas*, his sacrifice is highly regarded and its blood is sprinkled above. The opposite is true of a pauper. He is already belittled and if he brings a *chatas*, there is no *chidush* that he belittled himself and the blood of his sacrifice is sprinkled below. But if he brings an *olah*, which is a voluntary sacrifice, it is highly regarded and its blood is sprinkled above.